

## Remarks

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olson, Honsaker, Piper and Beauvais. The Office Action stated that:

“The patent to Olson discloses a mask formed from a substantially pliable material 10; Figs. 1-3, a first attachment member 15 on one portion of said mask for attachment to a first portion 16, Figs. 1, 3 of an eyeglass frame, and a second attachment member 15 on a second (opposite) portion of the mask for the attachment to a second (opposite) portion 16 of an eyeglass frame.”

The description of the patents of Honsaker, Piper and Beauvais disclose the same elements.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the following limitations:

A mask, wherein said mask comprises: a mask formed in a decorative pattern from a single piece of a substantially pliable material; a first attachment member on one portion of said mask integrated in said pattern of said mask for attachment to a first portion of an eyeglass frame; and a second attachment member on a second portion of said mask integrated in said pattern of said mask for attachment to a second portion of an eyeglass frame.

Olson, Honsaker and Piper fail to disclose or suggest the forming of a mask in a decorative pattern, nor do they disclose the integration of the first and second attachment members into the pattern of the mask.

Beauvais fails to disclose or suggest the forming of a mask from a single piece of a substantially pliable material, nor does Beauvais disclose the integration of the first and second attachment members into the pattern of the mask.

In order for a claim to be anticipated by prior art, all of the elements must be present. With the amended limitations, claim 1 is no longer anticipated by Olson, Honsaker, Piper or Beauvais.

Claims 2-11 depend on claim 1 and thus contain the limitations of claim 1. Therefore, these claims are also considered allowable for the reasons above.

Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olson and Honsaker. Claim 12 has been amended to include the following limitations:

A mask, wherein said mask comprises: a mask formed in a decorative pattern from a single piece of a substantially flat material; a first attachment member on one portion of said mask integrated in said pattern of said mask for attachment to a first portion of an eyeglass frame, and a second attachment member on a second portion of said mask integrated in said pattern of said mask for attachment to a second portion of eyeglass frame.

Olson and Honsaker fail to disclose or suggest the forming of a mask in a decorative pattern, nor do they disclose or suggest the integration of the first and second attachment members into the pattern of the mask. With the amended limitations, claim 12 is no longer anticipated by Olson or Honsaker.

Claims 13-22 depend from claim 12 and thus contain the limitations of claim 12. Therefore, these claims are also considered allowable for the reasons above.

Claim 23 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olson, Honsaker, and Beauvais. Claim 23 has been amended to include the following limitations:

A mask, wherein said mask comprises a mask formed in a decorative pattern from a single piece of a substantially pliable material; a first attachment member integrally formed on one portion of said mask and ~~bendable~~ foldable inward for attachment to a first portion of an eyeglass frame; and a second attachment member integrally formed on a second portion of said mask and ~~bendable~~ foldable inward for attachment to a second portion of an eyeglass frame.

Olson and Honsaker fail to disclose or suggest the forming of a mask in a decorative pattern, nor do they disclose or suggest the integration of the first and second attachment members on one portion of the mask.

Beauvais fails to disclose or suggest the forming of a mask from a single piece of a substantially pliable material, nor does Beauvais disclose or suggest the integration of the first and second attachment members on one portion of the mask. With the amended limitations, claim 23 is no longer anticipated by Olson, Honsaker or Beauvais.

Claims 24 and 25 depend from claim 23 and thus contain the limitations of claim 23. Therefore, these claims are also considered allowable for the reasons above.

Claim 26 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olson, Honsaker, Piper and Beauvais. Claim 26 has been amended to include the following

limitations:

A process for using a mask having a first attachment member and a second attachment member, said process comprising: attaching said first attachment member to a first portion of an eyeglass frame by folding said first attachment member and attaching said second attachment member to a second portion of an eyeglass frame by folding said second attachment member.

Olson, Honsaker, Piper and Beauvais fail to disclose or suggest the attachment by folding the first and second attachment members onto the first and second portions of an eyeglass frame. With the amended limitations, claim 26 is no longer anticipated by Olson, Honsaker, Piper and Beauvais.

Claim 27-33 depend from claim 26 and thus contain the limitations of claim 26. Therefore, these claims are also considered allowable for the reasons above.

Claim 34 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Olson and Honsaker. Claim 34 has been amended to include the following limitations:

A mask wherein said mask comprises: a face portion of said mask; a first attachment member integrally formed with said face portion and ~~bendable~~ foldable inward to attach to a first portion on an eyeglass frame; and a second attachment member integrally formed with said face portion and ~~bendable~~ foldable inward to attach to a second portion on an eyeglass frame.


Olson and Honsaker fail to disclose or suggest the integration of the first and second attachment members on one portion of the mask, nor do they disclose or suggest the attachment by folding the first and second attachment members onto the first and second portions of an eyeglass frame. With the amended limitations, claim 34 is no longer anticipated by Olson or Honsaker.

Claims 35-38 depend from claim 34 and thus contain the limitations of claim 34. Therefore, these claims are also considered allowable for the reasons above.

Expedited amendment, re-consideration, and allowance are respectfully solicited. In the event the Examiner has any questions or suggestions to expedite the allowance of the application, he is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

PEACOCK, MYERS & ADAMS, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Rod D. Baker", written over the firm name.

By:  
Rod D. Baker, Reg. No.35,434

Date: February 24, 2005

Attorneys for Applicant  
P.O. Box 26927  
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87125-6927  
Phone: (505) 998-1503  
Fax: (505) 243-2542

G:\AMDS\Meyers-Lewis-amendment1-mask.doc